



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,996	03/01/2005	Dietmar Schmidtbleicher	26523U	1357
20/529	7/5/0	07/15/2008		
NATH & ASSOCIATES 112 South West Street Alexandria, VA 22314			EXAMINER DEMILLE, DANTON D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3771	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/15/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/516,996

**Applicant(s)**

SCHMIDTBLEICHER ET AL.

**Examiner**

Danton DeMille

**Art Unit**

3771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF 298)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/1/5
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 13 lines 22-23 or the last line of the second full paragraph on page 13, it is not clear what is meant by “[apparent omission in source document]”.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the belts, straps with buckles and adjustable clips as recited in claim 15 and the vessel for accommodating a free-flowing material as recited in claim 13 and the shoe as recited in claim 14 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet”

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

**Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

In claim 1, line 5, it is recited that the supporting plates “can be” stationarily fixed in place. The term “can be” fails to positively claim the invention. It appears to be conditional upon unknown circumstances.

In line 1 of claims 2-7, there is no clear antecedent basis for “the two frame” supporting plates.

Claims 2-7 also recite that the double ended drive rollers are set in synchronous or asynchronous rotational motion. To what are they synchronized or asynchronized?

In claim 3, line 11 of page 20, it is not clear what is meant by “[sic; (3)]”.

In claim 3, lines 15-16, it is not clear what is meant by “[sic; (28)]”.

In claim 7, line 6, it is not clear what is meant by “[sic; (14)]”

Claim 8 recites the device is “characterized in that a further possibility exists for ...” The term “a further possibility exists for...” fails to positively recite the claimed invention. It appears to be conditional upon unknown circumstances. There is no clear antecedent basis for “the cover plates”.

In claim 9, line 2, there is no clear antecedent basis for "the cover plates".

In claim 13, line 1, there is no clear antecedent basis for "the cover plates".

In claim 15, reciting that the device "may be" provided with support mountings or adjustable clips fails to positively claim applicant's invention. It is not clear whether or not these items are being claimed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 1, 13, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Kost.**

Kost teaches, for example, a device with two table-like supporting plates 40, 41. Each supporting plate is mounted separately and independent of one another so as to be movable in three dimensions. A motorized drive 74, 69 is provided which sets the supporting plates in oscillating motion. Kost teaches in column 2, page 2, lines 61-65, that angular adjustment of the eccentric 51 relative to the worm wheel will vary the time sequence, in the cycle, between the vertical tilting movements and the horizontal twisting movements. This would adjust the timing sequence of the movements of each supporting plate. Therefore the movement of each supporting plate would be independent relative to the other by independently adjusting one supporting plate different from the other.

---

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kost.**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kost to include belts with the device for supporting the patient on the device. Kost already teaches providing handholds 58 for supporting the patient on the device. Additional belts would have been an obvious provision to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 2-12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Danton DeMille whose telephone number is (571) 272-4974. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 to 6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu, can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access

Art Unit: 3771

---

to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

15 July 2008

*/Danton DeMille/*  
Danton DeMille  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3771